UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/663,665	09/15/2000	Gregory L. Slaughter	5181-47300	2188

7590   11/01/2005

Robert C Kowert
Conley Rose & Tayon P C
P O Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398

EXAMINER
ZHEN, LI B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/663,665	SLAUGHTER ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Li B. Zhen	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 August 2005*.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-53* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-52* is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) *53* is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1 – 53 are pending in the current application.

Allowable Subject Matter

2.   Claim 53 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but
would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the
base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are
moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   **Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 22, 23, 27, 30, 31 and 43-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.
103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,851,089 to Erickson et al.
[hereinafter Erickson] in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,782,425 to Germscheid et al.
[hereinafter Germscheid].**

6.   As to claim 1, Erickson teaches the invention substantially as claim including a
method for the exchange of objects in a distributed computing environment [col. 25, line
57 – col. 26, line 14], comprising:

    user accessing a client device [col. 7, lines 1 – 16]; and

    generating a computer programming language object from a data representation
language representation of the object [a wrapper file has been created and stored, the

wrapper file can be read by a wrapper builder application and deserialized, by known methods, to reproduce the objects that the wrapper comprises; col. 26, lines 20 – 30], wherein the object is an instance of a class in the computer programming language [wrapper builder application employs serialization to encode an internal object representation of a wrapper into XML format; col. 26, lines 16 - 20], and wherein the object is accessible for use during the accessing the client device [wrapper serialization component 1170 provides for the storage and retrieval of wrappers in XML (Extensible Markup Language) through the process of Object Serialization; col. 25, line 59 - col. 26, line 13].

7.   Although Erickson teaches the invention substantially as claimed, Erickson does not teach deleting the computer programming language object in response to the terminating access.

However, Germscheid teaches secure access to sensitive data [col. 4, lines 42 – 53] and deleting a computer programming language object in response to the terminating access [termination of session; col. 16, lines 1 – 6] so that the deleted object is not accessible by subsequent users of the client device [deletes the CCISession object which provides the secure access; col. 16, lines 1 – 6].

8.   It would have been obvious to a person of ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teaching of deleting the computer programming language object in response to the terminating access as taught by Germscheid to the invention of Erickson because this would prevent unauthorized access to the object [col. 16, lines 4 – 5 of Germscheid] and deallocates the storage for the object after the user has finished accessing the object.

9.   As to claim 2, Erickson as modified teaches receiving a message in the data representation language from a service device in the distributed computing environment prior to the generating a computer programming language object [col. 16, lines 1 – 30 of Erickson], wherein the message includes the data representation language representation of the object [XML format; col. 26, lines 15 – 20 of Erickson].

10.   As to claim 6, Erickson as modified teaches generating a computer programming language object from a data representation language representation of the object is performed by a virtual machine executing within the client device [col. 25, lines 58 – 67 of Erickson; examiner notes that a virtual machine is inherent to the Java environment].

11.   As to claim 7, Erickson as modified teaches generating a plurality of computer programming language objects from data representation language representations of the objects [col. 25, line 59 - col. 26, line 13 of Erickson], and deleting the plurality of computer programming language objects in response to the terminating access [col. 16, lines 1 – 6 of Germscheid].

12.   As to claim 8, Erickson as modified teaches the data representation language is extensible Markup Language (XML) [XML; col. 25, line 59 – col. 26, line 13 of Erickson].

13.   As to claim 9, Erickson as modified teaches the computer programming language is the Java programming language [col. 25, line 59 – col. 26, line 13 of Erickson].

14.   As to claims 22 and 23, these are apparatus claims that correspond to method claims 1 and 2; note the rejections to claims 1 and 2 above, which also meet these apparatus claims.

15.   As to claim 27, this is rejected for the same reason as claim 7 above.

16.   As to claims 30 and 31, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 8 and 9 above.

17.   As to claims 43 and 44, these are product claims that correspond to method claims 1 and 2; note the rejections to claims 1 and 2 above, which also meet this product claim.

18.   As to claim 45, this is rejected for the same reason as claim 7 above.

19.   As to claim 46, this is rejected for the same reasons as claims 8 and 9 above.

20.   **Claims 3 – 5, 10 – 21, 24 – 26, 28, 29, 32 – 42 and 47 – 52 are rejected under
35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Erickson and Germscheid in view of
U.S. Patent No. 5,774,551 to Wu [cited in previous office action].**

21.   As to claim 3, Erickson as modified does not teach accessing a client device by
coupling an identification device to the client and terminating access by decoupling the
identification device from the client device.

        However, Wu teaches accessing a client device comprises the user coupling an
identification device to the client device [authentication services 109 may include
password or encrypted key based mechanisms such as…hardware/firmware based
mechanisms, such as smart-card; col. 15, lines 54 – 65], wherein the identification
device provides identification information of the user to the client device [the encrypted
authentication tokens may be stored in a smart card, or other non-public storage facility;
col. 10, lines 37 – 65], and wherein the termination the accessing comprises decoupling
the identification device from the client device [system entry service 107 initiates a
disconnect process, and handles the necessary physical disconnection and protocols
for disconnecting from the system 100, Fig. 5; col. 19, line 57 – col. 20, line 9].

22.   It would have been obvious to a person of ordinarily skilled in the art at the time
of the invention to apply the teaching of accessing a client device by coupling an
identification device to the client and terminating access by decoupling the identification
device from the client device as taught by Wu to the invention of Erickson as modified
because this allows any system entry service to be used transparently with any
combination of account, password, session, or authentication services, including
multiple instances of a given type of account management service and provides
supports for unified login and logout with multiple authentication services [col. 6, lines
15 – 26 of Wu].

23.   As to claim 4, Erickson as modified teaches the identification device is a smart card [the encrypted authentication tokens may be stored in a smart card, or other non-public storage facility; col. 10, lines 37 – 65 of Wu].

24.   As to claim 5, Erickson as modified teaches the accessing a client device comprises the user logging on to the client device [Unified login is accomplished through a authentication token mapping process; col. 3, lines 55 – 67 of Wu] by providing user identification to the client device [the encrypted authentication tokens may be stored in a smart card, or other non-public storage facility; col. 10, lines 37 – 65 of Wu], and wherein the terminating the accessing comprises the user logging off the client device [user logouts 501 of the system entry service 107, either explicitly by invoking a specific method of the system entry service 107, or implicitly by shutting off the workstation or terminal the user is working on; col. 19, line 57 – col. 20, line 9 of Wu].

25.   As to claim 10, Erickson as modified teaches a method for the secure exchange of objects in a distributed computing environment [col. 25, line 57 – col. 26, line 14 of Erickson], comprising:

a user accessing a client device [col. 7, lines 1 – 16 of Erickson];

the client device receiving a message in a data representation language from a service device in the distributed computing environment [col. 16, lines 1 – 30 of Erickson], wherein the message includes a data representation language representation of an object [XML format; col. 26, lines 15 – 20 of Erickson];

if the determining, determines the user has access rights to the computer programming language object [col. 15, lines 38 – 48 of Germscheid], generating the object from the data representation language representation of the object [a wrapper file has been created and stored, the wrapper file can be read by a wrapper builder application and deserialized, by known methods, to reproduce the objects that the wrapper comprises; col. 26, lines 20 – 30 of Erickson], wherein the object is an instance

of a class in the computer programming language [wrapper builder application employs serialization to encode an internal object representation of a wrapper into XML format; col. 26, lines 16 – 20 of Erickson], and wherein the object is accessible for use during the accessing the client device [col. 25, line 59 - col. 26, line 13 of Erickson]; and

if the determining determines the user does not have access rights to the computer programming language object, not generating the object [col. 8, lines 4 – 11 of Germscheid].

26.   As to claim 11, Erickson as modified teaches the message further includes access information for the computer programming language object, wherein the determining if the user has access rights to the computer programming language object uses the access information [col. 7, lines 38 – 50 of Germscheid].

27.   As to claim 12, Erickson as modified teaches deleting the computer programming language object in response to the user terminating access to the client device, wherein the deleted object is not accessible for use by subsequent users of the client device [col. 16, lines 1 – 6 of Germscheid].

28.   As to claims 13 – 15, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 3 – 5 above.

29.   As to claim 16, Erickson as modified teaches the user terminating the accessing the client device and storing the computer programming language object in response to the terminating access [wrapper file has been created and stored; col. 26, lines 21 – 30 of Erickson].

30.   As to claim 17, Erickson as modified teaches the user accessing the client device subsequent to the storing the object and accessing the stored object during the accessing the client device [col. 26, lines 21 – 30 of Erickson].

31.   As to claim 18, Erickson as modified teaches storing access rights information of the user with the object, wherein the accessing the stored object comprises verifying the access rights of the user with the stored access rights information [col. 7, line 60 – col. 8, line 3 of Germscheid].

32.   As to claims 19 – 21, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 6, 8 and 9 above.

33.   As to claims 24 and 25, these are apparatus claims that correspond to method claims 3 and 4; note the rejections to claims 3 and 4 above, which also meet these apparatus claims.

34.   As to claim 26, Erickson as modified teaches the device is further configured to accept user input [col. 4, lines 41 – 54 of Germscheid] to initiate the terminating the user access [unified logout process ensures that the user's authentication token and credentials are removed; col. 19, line 57 – col. 20, line 8 of Wu].

35.   As to claim 28, Erickson as modified teaches a processor, a memory [host computer 1404; col. 26, lines 58 – 67 of Erickson], and a virtual machine executed by the processor from the memory, wherein the generating is performed by the virtual machine [col. 25, lines 58 – 67 of Erickson; examiner notes that a virtual machine is inherent to the Java environment].

36.   As to claim 29, Erickson as modified teaches the accepting, the terminating, and the deleting are performed by the virtual machine [col. 25, lines 58 – 67 of Erickson], wherein the object is stored in the memory subsequent to the generating, and wherein, in the deleting, the object is deleted from the memory [col. 16, lines 1 – 6 of Germscheid].

37.   As to claims 32 – 36, these are system claims that correspond to method claims 10 – 14; note the rejections to claims 10 – 14 above, which also meet these system claims.

38.   As to claim 37, Erickson as modified teaches a memory [col. 26, lines 58 – 67 of Erickson], accept user input [col. 4, lines 41 – 54 of Germscheid] to terminate the access of the client device [col. 19, line 57 – col. 20, line 8 of Wu], and store the computer programming language object to the memory in response to the terminating access [col. 26, lines 21 – 30 of Erickson].

39.   As to claims 38 – 40, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 17, 18 and 28 above.

40.   As to claims 41 and 42, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 8 and 9 above.

41.   As to claims 47 – 50, these are product claims that correspond to method claims 10 – 13; note the rejections to claims 10 – 13 above, which also meet these product claims.

42.   As to claims 51 and 52, these are rejected for the same reasons as claims 16 – 18 above.

Conclusion

43.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Li B. Zhen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3768. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri, 8:30am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on 571-272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Li B. Zhen
Examiner
Art Unit 2194

lbz